

The Successors of the Seljuks in Asia Minor

Author(s): Stanley Lane-Poole

Source: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, New Series, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Oct., 1882), pp. 773-780

Published by: [Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25196938>

Accessed: 18-05-2015 00:07 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ART. XXV.—*The Successors of the Seljuks in Asia Minor.*

By STANLEY LANE-POOLE.

IN preparing the eighth volume of the Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, which will describe the coins of the Turks, I found myself confronted at the outset with a serious obstacle in the shape of twenty-five coins of various Turkish Amírs of Asia Minor, of whose history and chronology almost nothing appeared to be known, and of whose coinage the only examples hitherto published were five specimens (three varieties) described by Dr. E. von Bergmann and by Prof. J. Karabacek respectively, in the "Berichte" of the Vienna Academy, and in the "Numismatische Zeitschrift." The twenty-five examples in the British Museum had long remained unnoticed. Some I found in the 'Othmánly series; but most of them were discovered and partly identified by my uncle, the Keeper of Coins. The inscriptions were for the most part clear enough; and the difficulty consisted simply in the fact that the history of the princes who issued them was not generally known or easily accessible. The trouble and research that were necessary before I could arrange and attribute the coins and draw up approximately complete chronological lists of these dynasties and princes, are, I think, a sufficient excuse for the following pages, in which I shall try to smooth the way for my successors.

It is well known that on the breaking-up of the Seljúky kingdom of Er-Rúm, or Anatolia, ten separate dynasties divided its territories among themselves. The *Karásy* dynasty sprang up in Mysia; the lines of *Sárú-khán* and *Aydlu* in Lydia; of *Menteshá* in Caria; of *Tekkeh* in Lycia and Pamphylia; of *Hamíd* in Pisidia and Isauria; of *Karamán* in

Lycæonia; of *Kermián* in Phrygia; of '*Othmán* in Phrygia Epictetus; and of *Kizil-Ahmadly* in Paphlagonia.

All these dynasties were gradually absorbed by the rising power of the '*Othmánlis*, once the least among them. At the end of the eighth century of the Hijreh, not a hundred years after the assumption of independence by '*Othmán* I., the arms of Báyezíd I. made a clean sweep of the nine rival dynasties. After the battle of Angora, when Báyezíd was defeated and taken prisoner by Tímúr, and the Tatar horde almost annihilated for the moment the power of the '*Othmánlis* in Asia, seven of these dynasties were restored, and enjoyed a new lease of life for some twenty-five years; but in 829-32, five of them were re-absorbed by Murád II., and in 877 the '*Othmánly* rule was supreme over all the provinces which once owned the sway of the Decarchy, or *Zehnfürsten*.

Between A.H. 700, when these dynasties sprang up, and A.H. 877, when the last of them succumbed to the '*Othmánlis*, there is space for a good many princes, and, in the due settlement of their places and dates, there is ample room for confusion and doubt. Von Hammer's details are very insufficient; but much allowance must be made for this industrious historian, inasmuch as the originals he relied on are frequently to blame for his obscurity. The Turkish annalists are not only mutually contradictory, but they have a habit of speaking of any of these dynasts as *Karásy Oglu*, *Kermián Oglu*, i.e. son of Karásy, of Kermián, etc., without mentioning the name of the descendant in question. Prof. Karabacek has had the advantage of consulting a MS. of Munejjim Bashy for his account of the history of the Aydın princes,<sup>1</sup> and Dr. Bergmann has used the same authority, as well as the Byzantine historians, in his remarks on the family of Şárúkhán;<sup>2</sup> and to the data drawn from these papers a certain degree of finality may be granted, though an element of uncertainty still remains in several details.

<sup>1</sup> Gigliato des jonischen Turkomanen Fürsten Omar-beg: Numismatische Zeitschrift, vol. ii. pp. pp. 524-538, and vol. ix. pp. 207-214.

<sup>2</sup> Beiträge zur muham. Münzkunde: Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. lxxiii. p. 129 ff.

I have been able to supplement these authorities by the statements of a highly-esteemed Turkish historian, Sa'd-ed-dín, whose work Mr. E. J. W. Gibb (whose translations of Ottoman poetry have served to introduce an almost unknown literature to English readers) has most kindly consulted for me. I have also drawn some valuable notes from Char-moy's translation of the *Sharaf-Nameh* (St. Petersburg, four vols., 1868-1875), and from Rasmussen's *Annales Islamismi* (Hauniae, 1825), a useful little volume founded on good authorities.

The results of my investigations appear in the accompanying table of the Ten Dynasties, in which their rise on the ruins of the Seljúky kingdom, and their absorption in the 'Othmánly empire, originally one of their number, is shown, together with the break of a dozen years, created by the temporary annexation of the majority of these dynasties by the 'Othmánlis in 792-5.

It will be seen that the first dynasty to succumb to the rising power of the 'Othmánlis was that of Karásy, which was annexed in A.H. 737. Next, Iḥamíd was purchased in 783; and in 792 Báyezíd I. annexed Kermiyán, Tekkeh, Šárú-khán, Aydín and Menteshá in a single campaign, and finished his work in 794 and 795 by the conquest of Karamán and Kizil-Aḥmadly. These last seven were restored by Tímúr in 805, only to be again reduced by Murád II. and Moḥammad II.

With regard to individual dates, it is to be regretted that those of the earlier princes are not recorded by the historians, and as the coins are none of them earlier than the middle of the eighth century, they cannot supply this deficiency. Those dates which are underlined in my table are given on the authority of Sa'd-ed-dín. Those of Šárú-Khán and Aydín are based upon the authority of Munejjim Bashy, etc. (*apud* Bergmann and Karabacek); the date 746 for Ilyás is founded upon the last mention of Šárú-Khán himself; but Rasmussen gives 740 for his accession. Rasmussen's date 791 for Ishák of the same line is rejected on the evidence of a

coin of 776;<sup>1</sup> whilst the 'Omar who closes the dynasty is inserted on the strength of another coin, which is, however, unhappily dateless. Von Hammer mentions an "Umurbeg (Mortassen)" lord of Şárú-khán in 810 (vol. i. p. 348). In Aydın, Rasmussen gives 740 for Moḥammad's accession, confusing him, I fancy, with 'Omar. The latter ("Oumoûr Beg"), according to the Sharaf Nameh, was reigning in 759. If this is correct, Karabacek's date of 749 for the accession of 'Ysá may be a mistake. On the restoration under Tímúr, Juneyd obtained Ephesus, a portion of the Aydın territory, and on the death of 'Omar in 806 he succeeded to the whole province, apparently, however, only for a short time;<sup>2</sup> subsequently he also acquired Şárú-khán; but in 814 (Sa'd-ed-dín) or 816 (Von Hammer) he was reduced to vassalage by Moḥammad I., and ordered to issue his coins in his suzerain's name. That he did not do so always is shown by a very valuable coin of 825 in the British Museum, which I have had the happiness of identifying, on which Juneyd's name appears without that of the 'Othmánly Sultán. Juneyd was finally defeated and killed in 829, and his dominions were annexed to the Sultán's.

The Menteshá dates are very uncertain. The first I am able to give is 791 for Ilyás, according to Rasmussen. His restoration in 805 is established by a coin in the British Museum; and another coin definitely places his son Leyth as his successor in 824. This coin is the only authority, I believe, for the existence of Leyth. Von Hammer makes Ilyás the last prince of this line, and in an account of the fall of the Menteshá dynasty, which Mr. Gibb has kindly translated for me from Sa'd-ed-dín, there is no mention of him.

This account relates that "when Menteshá Oglu Ya'kúb Beg, the hereditary possessor of the kingdom and throne,

<sup>1</sup> The question whether it was Ishák or Khidr who was reigning at the time of Báyezid's conquest of Şárú-khán is discussed by Dr. Bergmann, who decides in favour of the former. The Turkish authorities are divided on this point. Some place Ishák's death in 790.

<sup>2</sup> In 805 to 806 Moḥammad I. retook Şárú-khán and Aydın, and reduced Kermiñan to vassalage. Apparently he left Juneyd in possession of at least part of his dominions.

had laid aside the borrowed garment of life, two sons of his, namely, Ilyás and Maḥmúd, remained. . . . But when Ilyás, who succeeded Maḥmúd (cast off the garment of life),<sup>1</sup> his sons, Uweys and Aḥmad, not content with the favours of the Heaven-supported monarch [the 'Othmánly Sultán, at whose court they were staying], felt a longing for the recovery of their hereditary kingdom, and planned and prepared for flight. On this being reported at the foot of the throne, they were imprisoned by the Imperial order in Bedevy Chár-ták; and the Sultán's servant Bálábán Pasha was named governor of Menteshá. . . . This event occurred about the beginning of the year 829. For two years Uweys and Aḥmad endured the pains of imprisonment; as they were, 'like the bird in the cage,' forbidden to go forth, their woes were excessive, and their griefs extreme." At last they managed to escape in sacks of hay. "It was the season when K̄ara 'Othmán Báýendery, ruler of Diyár Bekr, had returned from his summer encampments, and Aḥmad sought refuge with him. But he could not stay there, and went to Egypt, after which he went to Persia, where his name is lost. Uweys Bey had no strength to flee; but, dazed and giddy in the wilderness of bewilderment, he fell into the hands of the officers of the castle. When this was announced at the Sultán's court, the decree went forth that Uweys Bey and the castellan should be concealed from sight in the dungeon of non-existence."

Although he is not mentioned in this account, the Leyth of the coin of 824 could hardly have been the son of any other Ilyás; and the style of his coin exactly corresponds to that of his father of the year 805. He must have ruled some time between his father's death in 824 and the appointment of Bálábán in 829.

The British Museum coins also enable me to fix the date of 'Alá-ed-dín of K̄aramán at 756 at the latest, thus nearly confirming Rasmussen's figures 750; and a coin of Ibráhím in 829 proves that Sa'd-ed-dín and the Sharaf Nameh are both wrong in placing this prince's accession at 830. Dr. Berg-

<sup>1</sup> In another place Sa'd-ed-din says Ilyás died in 824.

mann gives 826 as the date of Moḥammad's death. Of the accession of 'Aly (a brother of Moḥammad of Karamán, set up by the contemporary Memlúk Sultán in 815, until Moḥammad was restored in 824, all according to Rasmussen), neither Sa'd-ed-dín nor any other authority that I know of makes any mention. As to the end of the Karamán dynasty, Von Hammer states that Pír Aḥmad succeeded Ibráhím in 1463 (868) ; but his brother Ishák ruled in Cilicia ; whence he retreated to Uzun Hasan, the Turkuman. Pír Aḥmad and another brother, Kásim, held out till 1473 (877) ; the Sharaf Nameh says till 873.

According to Prof. Karabacek, Yakhshy and others of the Ten Princes first began to strike coins in 1327 (728).

Besides coins of 'Alá-ed-dín, Moḥammad, and Ibráhím, of Karamán ; Ishák and 'Omar of Šárú-khán (and Latin issues) ; 'Ísá of Aydín ; Juneyd ; Ilyás and Leyth of Menteshá ; the British Museum possesses examples of a certain Mufettiḥ-ed-dín, a vassal of the Karamanians, apparently unknown to history ; of Moḥammad Artín ; of a Beglerbeg (probably an early 'Othmánly governor), and of Ishák Páshá, who was governor of Anatolia under Murád II. and Moḥammad II. (*e.g.* in 1432, according to Von Hammer). It is unnecessary to do more than refer to them here, as full descriptions are given in the forthcoming eighth volume of my Catalogue.

These coins add some important facts to what the historians relate. But a great deal remains to be ascertained, and private and public collections must be searched for further specimens, which may probably be hidden among the early Turkish issues. Dates are required to fill up many lacunae ; and mints are no less needed. As a guide to those who may find mint-names on these coins I may mention that the chief towns of the various dynasties, according to Von Hammer, were as follows :—Of Karamán—Larenda, Ermenak, Aḵserái, Aḵshehr, and Kóniyeh ; of Kızıl Ahmadly—Kastemúny, Janik, Sámsún, and Amásiyeh ; of Kermiyán—Kutáhiyeh ; of Hamíd—Aḵshehr, Begshehr, Sídishahr, Isparta, Karagháj ; of Aydín—Ismír (Smyrna) and Ayásuluk (Éphesus) ; of Šárú-khán—Mugnesia.

The following are the dynastic lists so far as I have been able to arrange them :—

KARÁSY.

				A.H.	A.D.
I. 'Ajlán Beg	...	...	...	circ. 700	1300
	Annexed	...	...	...	737 1336

KERMIYÁN.

I. Kormiyán Beg	...	...	...	circ. 700	1300
II. Alishir Beg.					
III. 'Alin Sháh.					
IV. Kty Beg.					
V. Ya'kúb Beg.					
	Conquered by Báyezid	...		792	1390

*Dynasty restored by Tímúr.*

Ya'kúb Beg restored	...	...	...	805	1402
Annexed	...	...	...	832	1429

ĤAMÍD.

I. Falak od-din Ĥamid	...	...	...	circ. 700	1300
II. Ĥoseyn Beg.					
	Purchased	...	...	...	783 1381

TEKKEN.

I. Tekkeh Beg	...	...	...	...	700 1300
II. ?					
	Conquered by Báyezid	...		792	1390

*Dynasty restored by Tímúr.*

III. 'Othmán	...	...	...	...	805 1402
	Annexed	...	...	...	830 1427

ŞÁRÚ-KHAN.

I. Şárú-khán	...	...	...	...	713 1313
II. Ilyás	...	...	...	...	746 1345
III. Ishák	...	...	...	...	776 1374
	Conquered by Báyezid	...		792	1390

*Dynasty restored by Tímúr.*

IV. Khiḍr Sháh	...	...	...	...	804 1401
	To	...	...	...	805 1402
V. 'Omar	...	...	...	circ. 809	1406
	To	...	...	...	813 1410
	Junryǎ succeeds	...	...	...	813 1410
	Annexed	...	...	...	829 1426

AYDÍN.

I. Aydın Beg	...	...	...	...	700 1300
II. Moḥammad	...	...	...	...	733 1332
III. 'Omar	...	...	...	...	740 1339
IV. 'Isá	...	...	...	...	749 1348
	Conquered by Báyezid	...		792	1390



*Dynasty restored by Timúr.*

V. 'Isá II.	...	...	...	...	805	1402
VI. 'Omar II.	...	...	...	...	806	1403
	<i>Juneyd succeeds</i>				806	1403
VII. Muştafa	...	...	...	...	824	1421
	<i>Annexed</i>				829	1426

## MENTESHÁ.

I. Menteshá Beg	...	...	...	circ. 700	1300	
II. Ya'kúb						
III. Maḥmúd						
IV. Ilyás	...	...	...	...	791	1389
Conquered by Báyezid				...	792	1390

*Dynasty restored by Timúr.*

Ilyás restored	...	...	...	...	805	1402
V. Leyth [Uwoys and Aḥmad]	...	...	...	...	824	1421
	<i>Annexed</i>				829	1426

## KIZIL-AḤMADLY.

I. Shems-ed-din Timúr	...	...	...	...	690	1289
II. Shuja'-ed-din.						
III. 'Adil Beg.						
IV. Báyezid Kötürüm.						
	<i>Conquered by Báyezid I.</i>				795	1393

*Dynasty restored by Timúr.*

V. Isfendiýar	...	...	...	...	805	1402
VI. Ibráhím	...	...	...	...	833	1430
VII. Ismá'il † 864						
VIII. Kizil Aḥmad	...	...	...	...	864	1459
	<i>Annexed</i>				864	1459

## KARAMÁN.

I. Karamán ... ..	circ.	620	1223
II. Moḥammad I. ... ..	circ.	643	1245
III. Maḥmūd ... ..	...	678	1279
IV. Yakhshy ... ..	...	719	1319
V. 'Alá-ed-din 'Aly ... ..	circ.	750	1349
Conquered by Báyezid		...	794
			1392

*Dynasty restored by Timúr.*

VI. Moḥammad II.	...	...	...	...	805	1402
VII. Ibráhím	...	...	...	...	829	1426
VIII. Pir Aḥmad and Ishák	...	...	...	...	869	1464
	<i>Annexed</i>				877	1472

Sept. 1, 1882.